

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

WILLIAM EDWARDS,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 08-C-0522

WARDEN WILLIAM POLLARD,

Respondent.

ORDER

On June 17, 2008, Petitioner William Edwards filed this petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, asserting that his state court conviction and sentence were imposed in violation of the Constitution. Petitioner was convicted in Milwaukee County Circuit Court of five counts of armed robbery with a threat of force as a party to a crime, and was sentenced to 23 years imprisonment. He is currently incarcerated at Green Bay Correctional Institution. On June 18, 2008, the Clerk of Court advised Edwards that his petition could not be reviewed unless he either paid the proper filing fee or requested leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Edwards has now submitted the \$5.00 filing fee, and the Court will proceed to give the case prompt initial consideration pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, which reads:

If it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court, the judge shall make an order for its summary dismissal and cause the petitioner to be notified. Otherwise the judge shall order the respondent to file an answer.

Rule 4, Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. During my initial review of habeas petitions, I look to see whether the petitioner has set forth cognizable constitutional or federal law claims and exhausted available state remedies.

In response to questions regarding his past litigation on the form by which he made his petition, Edwards describes generally the grounds he raised on direct appeal, that the Wisconsin Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment of conviction, and that the Wisconsin Supreme Court denied his petition for review. He also provides basic information about his conviction and sentence. However, Edwards has left the remainder of the form blank, and made no supplemental filings. Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases requires that a petition for habeas relief must “(1) specify all the grounds for relief available to the petitioner; (2) state the facts supporting each ground.” Despite the form prompting him to “[s]tate concisely every ground on which you claim you are being held unlawfully,” and “[s]ummarize briefly the facts supporting each ground,” Edwards has identified no legal grounds or facts to support his petition.

Thus, Edwards has failed to inform the Court or the Respondent why he believes his conviction and sentence were imposed in violation of the Constitution, and there can be no responsive pleading.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that this petition is summarily dismissed pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases.

Dated this 2nd day of July, 2008.

s/ William C. Griesbach
William C. Griesbach
United States District Judge